

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 5 and 9 – 10, and 12 – 17 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 9 are amended, claims 6-8 are cancelled, and claims 14-17 are added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 5, and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kazuhiro (JP 2000-243254). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite a step of removing the banks. This subject matter was previously found in claim 11. The Examiner alleges that such a step is shown in Kazuhiro, but the Applicants respectfully disagree. More particularly, although Kazuhiro teaches a manufacturing method of an electron emission element, Kazuhiro does not teach banks.

In contrast, the method of Kazuhiro is a process for forming resin composition layers 32 and 37 for increasing a hydrophilic property of a light irradiated part. The process of Kazuhiro also increases a water-absorptive property of a metal composition solution on the surface of a substrate 1 by light irradiation or by light irradiation and heating. Kazuhiro also teaches applying the metal composition solution to the light-irradiated part of the resin composition layer 32, and a process for forming element electrodes 2 and 3 and a conductive film 4 by thermally decomposing the resin composition layer. The resin composition layer 32, however, does not form the claimed banks. Because the resin composition layer 32 is not equivalent to the claimed banks,

Applicant respectfully asserts that the claimed method is not anticipated.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 2-4 and 12-13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Notwithstanding, Applicants have added new claims 14-17. These claims include the allowable subject matter. As such, claims 14-17 should be in condition for allowance.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 22, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley

Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/JAH